

INDOT 2030 Plan Update Early Coordination Meeting Notes
Vincennes District Meeting at the Vincennes District Offices
Thursday, June 17, 2004 10:30 AM – 12:00 Noon

ATTENDANCE: Dale Lucas, Development Engineer
John Curry, Program Development Engineer
Wayne Dittelburger, District Representative
Steve Smith, Manager – Long Range Transportation Planning Section
Jay Mitchell, Planner – Long Range Transportation Planning Section

OVERVIEW: The purpose of the meeting was to provide the Vincennes District with early input into the development of the 2004 INDOT Long-Range Plan update. This would be accomplished by reviewing the existing projects as listed in the Long Range Plan to determine if those projects should be retained, modified or removed from the plan, District identification and discussion of anticipated future expansion needs, and in conjunction, a review the deficiencies output (the 2030 No-Build E+C Network LOS and the 2030 Build Network LOS) from a run of the Statewide Transportation Model.

The MEETING: Steve Smith began the meeting with a description and explanation of the 2030 No-Build E+C Network and the 2030 Build Network (LOS) display maps. This prompted a response from District personnel who noted several items on the maps.

1. District personnel felt that the model's prediction of a Level of Service "D" for the E+C No-Build and "C" for the 2030 Build for the segment of US 41 from the I-64 interchange to the King's Mine interchange was incorrect. The District contended that the current LOS in this segment was poor and that it would only worsen with time.
2. Those present from the District questioned the output on both maps showing a LOS "E" on SR 67 from US 41 to Bruceville. They noted that that segment of highway was currently being upgraded to a "super 2" and that those improvements should continue to meet the capacity needs well into the 2030 time frame. Steve Smith said that the results might be a coding error where the new "Super 2" segment may not have been coded.
3. In looking at the 2030 No-Build E+C Network map, the District wanted to know why the SR 66 segment from Hatfield to Rockport showed a LOS "E" since there was a project in the plan to widen that segment to four lanes. Steve Smith noted that the project had not advanced far enough along to be included as a "committed" project for this network. He noted that the project shows up in the Build map and that the LOS improves to an "A" level.
4. The District also pointed out that the maps incorrectly continue to label SR 161 from Owensboro, Kentucky to REO as US 231. Since the 2030 Build Network indicates that the LOS on this segment from the Ohio River to old SR 45 will decrease to "E," the District wanted to know if Planning was looking at any improvements to this segment.

The response was that since there were no plans to add capacity to this segment of roadway. This was due to the limitations of the old, narrow Owensboro Bridge and the fact the US 231 was being relocated and improved to the east of Owensboro beginning with the new, four-lane US 231 Natcher Bridge. The District concurred.

5. The District also questioned LOS “E” and “F” on both the 2030 No-Build E+C and 2030 Build Network maps for SR 162 from Ferdinand to Jasper. They thought that there might be some heavier truck traffic for that segment but that Planning needed to check the traffic volume and capacity since this section of roadway had recently been reconstructed to 3r standards. It was also noted that the nearby new, four-lane US 231 project was not properly modeled due to the yet to be completed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The US 231 new alignment roadway that was coded into the model was done so in a zigzag fashion around the towns of Huntingburg and Jasper based and was based on a previous alternative that had since been rejected. The current draft EIS for the project would place the roadway entirely to the east or west of the two cities. If the final, preferred US 231 alternative were to follow the eastern corridor, it is likely that it would pull much of the traffic from SR 162 due to its nearby proximity.
6. The District noted that the maps confirmed a need that they had identified for SR 56 west of Jasper. The District has programmed a series of intersection improvements for this segment of roadway. It was suggested that with the high growth rate for the area and the increased commercial traffic, it might make more sense to look at an added capacity project along this corridor, at least as far as Ireland. Another suggestion was that such a project should extend westward to SR 257 which would be consistent with the deficiencies uncovered by the model.

PROJECT EVALUATION DISCUSSIONS:

1. US 231 From South of Haysville to the New I-69: The District believes that this segment of roadway should be placed in the plan as an added capacity 4-lane project, or at least a high-end 3r/4r project. Current plans call for US 231 to be built out to a four-lane facility from the Ohio River to just south of Haysville. From Haysville north to US 50, the consultant determined that there was insufficient demand to add travel lanes. The District did program a reconstruction project (DES #0015100) for this segment of roadway and they would like for the project to be at a minimum, a “Super 2” project.

***Comment:** While it appears that there does not exist a current compelling need to add significant capacity to this segment of US 231, it may come under further study as part of the I-69 Tier II work. In the meantime, the reconstruction project (DES #0015100) will probably take care of any geometric deficiencies.*

2. US 50 from Washington to Loogootee LRP Projects 246 (DES 8918065) and 62 (DES 7001080): The District wants these two projects to move up and be constructed as a four-lane facility earlier. It was noted that there is a significant amount of truck traffic along this segment. The projects had been placed on “Hold” pending the outcome of the I-69 EIS. All of the expansion projects along US 50 were reviewed in May of 2002 by an

internal US 50 Expansion Committee. At that time, it was agreed that these two projects (#246 and #62) would advance as high-end two-lane 3r/4r projects with right-of-way for a future four-lane facility. The District would also like to see old US 50 through Washington be relinquished.

Comment: *This segment of US 50 will be revisited. It will most likely come under scrutiny as part of the I-69 TIER II work and relinquishment issues such as this will most likely be revisited as part of the larger I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis project.*

3. SR 56 From SR 257 to Jasper: As noted, the 2030 No Build E+C and the 2030 Build Networks indicated a poor LOS “F” for much of this segment of SR 56. The District has programmed a series of intersection improvements along this segment but would prefer to add capacity with a combination “Super 2” and median construction project.

Comment: *The Planning Section will give consideration to an added capacity project for this segment of SR 56.*

4. US 41 from I-64 in Vanderburgh County to the King’s Mine Interchange in Gibson County: The District strongly recommends that this segment of US 41 be improved to a six-lane facility. Toyota Motors has built two plants in Gibson County near the King’s Mine Interchange. This has resulted in some spin-off production at other plants near the Toyota site. Many of the employees at these plants commute on US 41 from Vanderburgh County. And the District also notes that much of the commercial freight associated with these manufacturing facilities uses I-64 and US 41. The District had programmed a mega added travel lanes project for US 41 from Boonville/New Harmony Road in Evansville to the King’s Mine interchange, a distance of approximately 18 miles. However, after an April 2002 consultation meeting between the District and the Central Office/Programming, it was agreed that DES #0101170 would be amended to a 10 mile reconstruction project instead.

Comment: *The 2030 No Build E+C indicates a LOS of “D” for this segment of US 41. However, the 2030 Build Network, which includes I-69, indicate an acceptable LOS of “C” for this segment of US 41. This is consistent with data from the Pre-Engineering Section’s assessment of this segment of US 41. In the absence of more data to support a need for added travel lanes on US 41, the Planning Section is not prepared to advance this project. The 2030 Build Network does indicate some operational problems at some of the intersections which would warrant intersection improvement projects.*

5. LRP Project 487 – Mobility Corridor: The District questioned the need for added travel lanes on this project. The Project is a placeholder for a future Mobility Corridor that will run along SR 60 from Mitchell, through Salem to the Clarksville area. The rough RFC date for the project is 2019.

Comment: *Mobility Corridors currently have no specific design standard. Depending upon demand, they can be two, four, or even six lane roadways. In this case, since the District does not feel that there will be sufficient future demand for a four-lane roadway,*

the Planning Section will review the option of amending this segment to a high end, 4r (Super 2 type) project.

6. LRP Project 708 – SR 56 in Hazleton: The District felt that this project was more of an intersection improvement than an added travel lanes project.

Comment: *After a short discussion of the project limits and scope, the Planning Section concurred with the District and agreed to remove it from the plan. This action will not impede the advancement of the project as an intersection improvement*

7. LRP Project 60 added travel lanes on SR 261 from SR 66 to Jenner Road in Warrick County: The District pointed out that there is rapid residential development in the area surrounding SR 261 in Warrick County. The District feels that the ATL project on SR 261 (LRP ID #60) should be expanded an additional 5 miles to SR 62 south of Boonville. This observation was also borne out of a preliminary field check for the project.

Comment: *The Planning Section noted that they would take this suggestion under advisement and consult with the MPO and with the Pre-Engineering Section before making a final recommendation.*

8. SR 61 Boonville: The Planning Section advised the District that a “placeholder” project would be put into the plan pending the outcome of an environmental assessment being performed by Beam Longest & Neff regarding congestion on SR 61 in Boonville. This action has strong local support and the support of the Evansville MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization).
9. I-164 from the New Ohio River Bridge to I-64: The Evansville MPO has placed an ATL project in their 2030 plan for this 18 mile segment of I-164. The MPO’s modeling of the segment of I-164 puts it in an unacceptable level of service by 2030. The segment will be added to the Long Range Plan in the 2030 time frame as a “placeholder” for the year 2030.
10. LRP Project 79 ATL on SR 57 fro US 41 to I-164: The District expressed some concern that this “placeholder” project may not be needed and that he would like to see this segment become a candidate for relinquishment.

Comment: *The project is listed in the MPO’s plan and the MPO believes strongly that the project is needed. The Planning Section will leave the project in this plan update but will continue to monitor its purpose and need and to consult with both the District and the MPO.*